

02-01-06

IFW

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

3

Application Number

10/717,851

Filing Date

November 19, 2003

First Named Inventor

Quin Soderquist

Art Unit

3616

Examiner Name

George D. Spisich

Attorney Docket Number

14291

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)☐

Fee Transmittal Form

☐

Fee Attached

☐

Amendment/Reply

☐

After Final

☐

Affidavits/declaration(s)

☐

Extension of Time Request

☐

Express Abandonment Request

☐

Information Disclosure Statement

☐

Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)

☐Reply to Missing Parts/
Incomplete Application☐Reply to Missing Parts
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53☐

Drawing(s)

☐

Licensing-related Papers

☐

Petition

☐Petition to Convert to a
Provisional Application☐Power of Attorney, Revocation
Change of Correspondence Address☐

Terminal Disclaimer

☐

Request for Refund

☐

CD, Number of CD(s) _____

☐ Landscape Table on CD

Remarks

☐

After Allowance Communication to TC

☐Appeal Communication to Board
of Appeals and Interferences☐Appeal Communication to TC
(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)☐

Proprietary Information

☐

Status Letter

☒Other Enclosure(s) (please identify
below):Response to
Election/Restriction Requirement**SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT**

Firm Name

Autoliv ASP, Inc.

Signature

Printed name

Sally Brown

Date

January 31, 2006

Reg. No.

37,788

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

Hollie Cole

Date

January 31, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Appl. No. 10/717,851
Response dated January 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	10/717,851	Confirmation No.: 1718
Applicant	:	Quin Soderquist	
Title	:	APPLIQUE FILM AIRBAG COVER	
Filed	:	November 19, 2003	
TC/A.U.	:	3616	
Examiner	:	George D. Spisich	
Docket No.	:	14291	

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 9, 2005. The Examiner has required an election between species I (purportedly found in Figure 2) and species II (purportedly found in Figure 3). In accordance with this requirement, Applicant elects species I as found in Figure 2. Applicant believes that at least claims 1, 5-8, 10-16, 20-22, 24-31, 34-38, and 40-43 are readable on this elected species.

This present election is made with traverse. Specifically, Applicants submit that the imposition of such a restriction requirement is improper and that all of the independent claims are indeed generic and cover both the embodiment disclosed in Figure 2 and the embodiment disclosed in Figure 3. The present invention relates to a novel type of airbag cover that includes a "unitary appliqué film" (or, in the case of claim 43, an unitary appliqué film means). As defined by the specification:

The appliqué film 14 of the present invention is unitary. This means that the appliqué film 14 may be formed from a single,

integrally formed piece of material or from a plurality of pieces of material or layers attached together.


Specification, p. 14, lines 10-13. Thus, based upon the clear disclosure of the specification, Applicant is using the term “unitary appliqué film” to include both embodiments with only one layer of material (*see* Figure 2) and embodiments having a plurality of layers attached together (*see* Figure 3). As such, the embodiments shown in Figures 2 and 3 are not patentably distinct, but are variants of a single invention.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that the Examiner’s interpretation of the embodiment shown in Figure 3 is imprecise and that this imprecision leads to this erroneous restriction requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that “Figure 3[] [is] drawn to an airbag cover having multiple layers and a bulging tear area that disconnects the layers of the back side of the airbag cover.” As taught by the application, the inclusion of this “bulging tear area”—or as defined in the specification, the “local peak”—does not necessarily have to be present in the embodiment of Figure 3. Rather, this “local peak” is an additional feature recited and claimed in dependent claims 9, 23, 39. The fact that this “local peak” does not necessarily have to be present in the embodiment of Figure 3 means that the only difference between the embodiments of Figures 2 and 3 is the number of layers used in the airbag cover. Clearly, under the definitions given above, the term “unitary appliqué film” includes embodiments with only one layer of material and embodiments having a plurality of layers attached together.

Accordingly, there is no basis which would support the present restriction requirement and as such, this requirement is respectfully traversed. Withdrawal of this restriction requirement is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this election response that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Appl. No. 10/717,851
Response dated January 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sally J. Brown", written over a horizontal line.

Sally J. Brown
Reg. No. 37,788
Attorney for Applicants

Date: January 31, 2006

AUTOLIVASP, INC.
3350 Airport Road
Ogden, Utah 84405
(801) 625-4934

S:\ALLCLIENTS\2949 Autoliv\2949.2.156\2949-2-156ResponseTo09Jan06RestrictionReqmt.doc